

ACAP Steering Committee Meeting Report

*October 6 - 7, 2004
Helsinki, Finland*

Arctic Council Action Plan to Eliminate Pollution of the Arctic (ACAP)

Table of Contents

1. Welcome and Introduction
 2. Approval of Agenda
 3. Annex A - Project Progress Reports
 - 3 a. Multilateral Cooperative Project for Phase-out of PCB Use and Management of PCB-contaminated Wastes in the Russian Federation
 - 3 b. Reduction/Elimination of Emissions of Dioxins and Furans in the Russian Federation
 - 3 c. Reduction of Atmospheric Mercury Releases from the Arctic States
 - 3 d. Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles in the Russian Federation
 - 3 e. Russian-Norwegian Cleaner Production Centre
 - 3 f. AMAP/ACAP Fact Sheets on PCBs, Dioxins/Furans, Mercury and Cleaner Production
 4. Annex B - Project Progress Reports
 - 2 a. Brominated Flame Retardants
 - 2 b. Guidelines for EIA on Radioactive Waste
 5. Financial Issues
 6. New Project Proposals
 - 6 a. Barents Euro Arctic Council/Working Group on Environment (BEAC/WGE)/ACAP Cooperation
 - 6 b. Permanent Participants
 - 6 c. Observers
 7. Other Business
 8. ACAP Webpage
 9. Guidelines for Developing
- Appendix A: ACAP Steering Committee Meeting Agenda
Appendix B: List of Participants
Appendix C: List of Documents
Appendix D: Revised Financial Status Table

ACAP Steering Committee Meeting Report October 6-7, 2004

Helsinki, Finland

1. *Welcome*

Report form the Chairman and Secretariat

The Finnish SAO, Ambassador Ulfstedt opened the meeting by lauding the “action” component of ACAP and urging the Steering Committee to maintain its commitment to action.

ACAP Chair Bob Dyer explained the situation regarding the reorganization of the different Russian Ministries and explained that Mr A. Tsygankov, Russian-Norwegian Cleaner Production Center, had been authorized in writing to speak for the R.F. Ministry of Natural Resources. The Chairman talked to the Steering Committee about the different actions and decisions that the Steering Committee needs to make during the meeting. One was regarding the BFR project proposal, which has to be formally submitted to the Senior Arctic Officials. Another action discussed by the Chairman to be taken by the Steering Committee was the status of ACAP as an official Arctic Council working group in 2004. At the moment ACAP has authority until 2006.

The Chairman mentioned the need of information on development of Russia’s National Implementation Plan (NIP) under the Stockholm Convention to ensure that ACAP efforts are properly coordinated with Russia’s performance under Stockholm. Other issues: ACIA charge to ACAP, PAME Arctic Marine Strategy, U.N. warning of obsolete pesticide stocks as a “time bomb” for Eastern Europe.

2. **Approval of the Agenda**

The Steering Committee adopted the agenda. The final list of participants is appended to this report.

3. **Project Progress Reports – Annex A Projects**

A. PCBs (Vitaly Kimstach, AMAP)

Vitaly Kimstach provided an overview of the project status to date. He mentioned the project has received key approvals from the Russian authorities for construction. However, they have encountered several problems with the Russian federal governmental authorities in moving the project forward. Leningrad Oblast officials are denying there is a PCB problem in the oblast and wants the project moved to another area. Russia has denied some pre-existing data; Denmark and NEFCO have encountered the same problem. Other issues are also delaying construction—e.g., uncertainty about the number of permits needed for construction. Estimates range from 35-135 permits. AMAP has \$125k of estimated \$200k needed in 2005.

Denmark reported on the Collection and Storage of PCB-Containing Electrical Equipment in Leningrad Oblast and St. Petersburg. Project progress has been slow-- greatly affected by the reorganization of the regional administration and the problems affecting NEFCO’s activities.

Canada mentioned that ACAP should not consider projects in which landfill is an option for disposal of POPs materials. Denmark suggested using words from the Pesticide Program – “have to be handled according to international standards”.

Canada also mentioned that AMAP did not cover all destruction activities in Russia, and other organizations might be involved in this area. He proposed an inventory of activities on POPs destruction technologies to help focus the Steering Committee.

***Action Item:** Implement Phase 3 of the PCB Project to include shipment, assembly and testing of the plasma arc PCB-destruction systems.*

B. Dioxins and Furans (Niklas Johansson, Sweden)

Niklas Johansson reported on issues facing this project since the February 2004 working group meeting. After the presentation, the U.S. commented that it has been three years since the project started, that the Committee still hasn't seen a report, and that the project would benefit from information on what Russia is doing with the National Implementation Plan under the Stockholm Convention. Ella Barnes explained that the Russian implementing organization working on the Dioxin/Furans Project is also the implementing organization for the Stockholm Convention. Denmark requested that Russia give an update at the next meeting on the status of the National Implementation Plan. The deadline for the NIPs is May 17, 2006.

Russia observed that environmental regulatory functions in the Russian Federation (including for dioxin) would be transferred to a new oversight agency partly staffed by personnel transferred from the Ministry of Natural Resources. Senior management for this new agency will probably not be designated until the end of this year; only then will it be possible to predict how vigorously Russia will address the dioxin problem, especially in the regions.

Finland questioned when Russia would ratify the Stockholm Convention. Russia replied that ratification will come quickly but cannot say when specifically. AMAP noted that the Russian State Duma would hold hearings on the Stockholm Convention implementation on October 11.

Russia pointed out that, in addition to direct emissions of dioxins/furans to Arctic air and water, the problem of dioxin-contaminated soil and sediment (e.g., in the Angara River basin) also poses a threat to the Arctic environment. AMAP suggested that ACAP remain focused on primary sources of pollution. Denmark supported AMAP's opinion and stressed the importance of addressing incineration as a source of dioxin contamination to the Arctic.

***Action Item:** Achieve measurable reduction of the dioxins/furans emissions at one pulp and paper industrial facility in Arkhangelsk Region.*

C. Mercury (Mikala Klint, Denmark)

Mikala Klint, Danish EPA presented the status of the project on Reduction of Atmospheric Releases from the Arctic States. The three phases of the project are: 1) assessment and prioritization (inventory of mercury sources); 2) site specific prioritization and selection of pilot project and; 3) implementation of pilot projects.

Final drafts of the "Assessment of Mercury Releases from the Russian Federation" and the "Arctic Mercury Release Assessment" were distributed to the Steering Committee. The Russian Mercury Inventory Report awaits final approval from the new Russian Federal Agency. The Regional Mercury Assessment Report has been distributed to the Project Steering Group for final approval at the next Mercury Project Working Group Meeting, tentatively scheduled for November 4-5, 2004 in Helsinki, Finland.

Denmark discussed some of the highlights of the Arctic Mercury Assessment Report. Major sources of atmospheric mercury releases identified in the report are: coal combustion, metal

production and incineration of municipal waste and hazardous waste.

A draft document on the discussion of further actions on mercury release reductions will be discussed at the November 4-5, 2004 Mercury Project Working Group meeting. The Project Steering Group and Project Working Group has identified five sectors for further evaluation: 1) copper and copper/nickel smelters; 2) extraction and processing of zinc; 3) extraction of gold; 4) coal power plants; and 5) handling/recycling of mercury containing waste.

The Chairman commented his understanding was that there was consideration of a demonstration project outside Russia. Denmark commented that only Russia has shown interest. Mr. Pechkurov has been identified as the main contact person for mercury in Russia. Finland mentioned interest in mercury containing pesticides.

Denmark observed that the “circumpolar approach” remained a matter of differing opinions within the Mercury Project Working Group. Norway stated that the circumpolar approach remained an integral part of the project, and that the report required an assessment component. Canada asked whether ACAP is prepared to support follow-up activities in Russia even though Russia has not signed the LRTAP Mercury Protocol.

The draft Arctic Mercury Release Assessment Report has a disclaimer on page 18 stating that the document does not reflect the opinions of the Project Working Group. The Chairman made the point that if the document does not reflect the opinion of the Project Working Group, then whose opinion is it? It was clarified that what the disclaimer meant was that the Project Working Group has only collected the data and is not taking responsibility for data quality. Denmark suggested that the Project Working Group might want to rephrase the disclaimer at their next meeting.

Russia pointed out that mercury is a migratory pollutant and is a large problem in the Angara River basin (eastern Siberia) owing to major battery production there; they suggested that the project focus attention on mercury from industrial landfills. The U.S. thanked Denmark for providing under this project something that the international community had not been able to produce in Russia--meaningful, comprehensive data on mercury sources and releases. The U.S. mentioned a non-ACAP bilateral project on mercury in waste dumps in Moscow City and offered to report any significant results of this project as they become apparent.

At their upcoming meeting, the Project Working Group will discuss a workplan for Phase II, as well as specific sites for further evaluation. With leftover funding from Phase I, it will be possible to support one pre-feasibility study in Phase II. The Project Working Group may seek to focus on a region in Russia where more than one sector can be addressed. NEFCO suggested we keep in mind synergies we have to achieve with BEAC and others.

The Chair cautioned that a major pre-feasibility study will be expensive and time-consuming and that ACAP is under challenge to show results in a limited time. He suggested that the Mercury Project Working Group consider small, replicable demonstration projects. Denmark said that they hope to start a demonstration project in 2005.

Action Item: *Prepare a regional assessment of existing and planned initiatives addressing source categories in the Arctic States. Identify possible measures to be followed up, and implement a model mercury source control and reduction project in Russia.*

D. Obsolete Pesticides (Jakko Henttonen, Finland)

The project consists of three phases: Phase I – Development of inventories in the eleven priority regions of the Russian Federation; Phase II – Implementation of preventive measures in

improvement of storage conditions and movement/integration of stocks of obsolete pesticides, identification of unknown stocks, as well as assessment and selection of existing technologies and methods of destruction/disposal of stocks; Phase III stipulates actual destruction/disposal of obsolete pesticides in an environmentally sound manner. A September 16, 2004 promotional event marked the successful completion of inventory, analysis and repackaging activities in the Arkhangelsk Oblast.

The Project Working Group visited two storage facilities in Komi Republic and two in Tyumen Oblast. Timo Seppala gave a presentation on the visit to Tyumen where stocks of obsolete pesticides inventoried were repackaged and moved to temporary storage. The Steering Committee questioned what would be the next steps after storage. Finland answered that they are keeping a close look for results from PCB destruction facility for products with chlorine.

Denmark reported on their bilateral project in the Pskov and Vologda Oblasts, where over 350 tons and 250 tons of obsolete pesticide stocks have been identified, respectively. A completed inventory is expected next spring. Denmark also mentioned that the Danish report on PCB destruction technologies would be available next month on the Internet.

The U.S. (Gary Waxmonsky) expressed concerns regarding permitting and expenses associated with transportation of pesticides over long distances within Russia. The Russian representative concurred and observed that a mobile destruction facility would be preferable, though no such technology is currently available in Russia.

The Chairman suggested a presentation/briefing should be made to the new Ministry of Agriculture and the Phytosanitary and Veterinary Service to introduce them to the ACAP Obsolete Pesticides Project.

Canada noted that authorities in Tyumen Oblast have undertaken good work in managing obsolete pesticides; he asked that the ACAP Report to SAOs/Ministers commend such regional initiatives in Russia.

Members of the Steering Committee discussed bringing to the attention of SAOs/Ministers the reported intention on the part of the Ministry of Agriculture and Phytosanitary/Veterinary Service to formulate a national pesticide management plan ("federal targeted program") for the Russian Federation. The Chair urged the Russian representative to convey to authorities in Moscow the desire of ACAP Steering Committee to be informed of progress on this national plan at the next Steering Committee meeting.

Finland reported that there has been no progress on their bilateral project on DDT stocks in Karelia since the last Steering Committee Meeting held in Washington.

***Action Item:** Complete inventory and repackaging and safe temporary storage of the obsolete and prohibited pesticides in the remaining six priority regions in the Arctic.*

E. Cleaner Production (Aleksander Tsygankov, Russia)

Ms. Elena V. Kalaida gave a presentation on the implementation of “Cleaner Production” program at the Norilsk Nickel Polar Division. She mentioned that Norilsk Nickel had incorporated cleaner production (CP) into its long-term environmental strategy and has introduced CP practices and incentives in all sectors of production. The company will fund another CP training phase in November 2004, to include a “financial engineering” component.

The Steering Committee agreed to accept the CP/Norilsk project report as final subject to minor editing changes, to include specification of the funding provided by ACAP vis-à-vis that provided by Norilsk Nickel itself. The report could then be forwarded to SAOs. The Chair suggested that the Ministerial Declaration point out that ACAP has helped identify a solution to industrial pollution in the Arctic.

Norway welcomed Norilsk Nickel’s commitment to CP in all sectors of production. The U.S. (Ella Barnes) suggested ACAP participate with Norilsk Nickel in developing a model Environmental Management System (EMS). The U.S. (Gary Waxmonsky) said that it might be premature to advance application of EMS in Russia since the latter’s efficacy in general was still a matter of study and debate. Denmark cautioned against expanding ACAP’s statement of work.

Chair asked if Steering Committee was finished with CP as a separate project, noting that, from a purely financial point of view, Cleaner Production should be viewed as one of ACAP’s more successful investments.

NEFCO reminded the Steering Committee that Cleaner Production is a long-term, open-ended methodology, which extends throughout the industrial process. While congratulating ACAP for the success of the CP/Norilsk Project, NEFCO observed that many other enterprises in the Arctic could benefit from CP training and assistance. The Steering Committee agreed that CP should be kept on the ACAP agenda, though no formal CP working group should be formed in the absence of a specific new CP project. The Steering Committee also welcomed voluntary updates on CP activities at Norilsk Nickel. The Chair asked that comments on the CP/Norilsk Project report be conveyed to Russia (Mr. Tsygankov) by October 24 to allow for presentation at the upcoming SAO meeting.

The U.S. (Ella Barnes) asked if the Norilsk report could be used to prepare a short fact sheet for the SAO meeting. Russia said that it could make a short synopsis of the report and send to ACAP Steering Committee. It was agreed that ACAP Secretariat would prepare a cover sheet for the CP report and fact sheet.

Russia (Mr. Tsygankov) invited all Steering Committee members and observers to an International Cleaner Production conference in Moscow, December 6-9, 2004, which is expected to contribute toward formulation of a National Cleaner Production Action Plan for Russia. The Ministry of Natural Resources is a sponsor of the conference. The U.S. (Ella Barnes) announced its intention to provide modest financial support for the Conference.

***Action Item:** Sponsor and participate in the International Conference on “Cleaner Production as a Contribution to Sustainable Development” in Moscow, Russia on December 6-9, 2004.*

F. Fact Sheets (Vitaly Kimstach, AMAP)

The Steering Committee received draft fact sheets on BFRs, Obsolete Pesticides, PCBs, and Mercury projects. Canada recalled the need for clarity of purpose regarding ACAP fact sheets, and urged that they be uniform in format. It was agreed that the audience for the fact sheets was the general public. Norway will be responsible for assembling the Steering Committee comments on the BFR Fact Sheet and sending it to the AMAP Secretariat; Timo Seppala will do the same for

the Obsolete Pesticides Fact Sheet. Comments should be received by October 14, 2004. The final fact sheets will be presented to the SAOs and then will be posted on the ACAP webpage. The BFR Fact Sheet will be printed as an AMAP fact sheet, the Obsolete Pesticides product will be produced as an ACAP/AMAP fact sheet. Since the Mercury Project Working Group will not meet until early November, they will not have comments ready on the Mercury Fact Sheet by the October 14 deadline. It was agreed that the Fact Sheet on Cleaner Production should focus specifically on the CP/Norilsk Project.

Sweden mentioned that they have a fact sheet on the Dioxins/Furans Project but that its function is different. This Dioxins/Furans Fact Sheet was designed for the industry and government in Russia. It has been printed and distributed solely in Russian.

Vitaly Kimstach presented two draft budgets for the preparation of the Fact Sheets. The higher estimate of preparing each draft Fact Sheet is around €6,000, assuming subject experts will prepare them. The lower estimate is around €4,000 assuming Project Chairs prepare the draft text as an in kind contribution. The Steering Committee approved the use of funds for preparing the Obsolete Pesticides Fact Sheet.

***Action Item:** Complete the AMAP/ACAP Fact Sheets on PCBs, Dioxin/Furans, Mercury and Cleaner Production.*

4. Project Progress Reports – Annex B Projects

a. Brominated Flame Retardants (BFRs) (Gunnar Futsaeter, Norway)

The Steering Committee had only had minor comments on the draft BFR proposal (from U.S. and Canada) and agreed that the proposal should be the basis of a recommendation for Annex A status to the SAOs/Ministers. AMAP agreed to prepare the BFR Fact Sheet for distribution at the November 2004 Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting. Two experts commissioned by AMAP are now working on a peer-reviewed journal article on BFRs.

***Action Item:** Initiate the new project on brominated flame retardants (BFRs) and coordinate with AMAP on their BFR database development.*

b. Guidelines for EIA on Radioactive Waste (Gunnar Futsaeter, Norway)

The Steering Committee had a discussion regarding the EIA project and agreed to transfer the project to the purview of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Norway will implement the project bilaterally.

5. Financial Issues

NEFCO offered a presentation on a possible Arctic Council Project Support Fund (PSF). It was stressed that a PSF should: a) focus solely on Arctic Council projects; b) work only with specific projects, not other program activities; and c) favor project preparation over demonstration project

implementation. NEFCO was confident that a PSF would not alter existing decision-making processes within the Arctic Council. After some discussion, NEFCO estimated that at least €3,000,000 would be needed for a workable PSF.

The Chair asked if any projects have been put on hold because of lack of funding. Finland spoke on behalf of the Obsolete Pesticides Project and noted that available funding could support completion of work in six to seven of the eleven targeted oblasts in Russia. Delay in completing work in the other oblasts could be risky, as some regions might undertake unsound solutions to the Obsolete Pesticide problem. Additional funding would also facilitate ACAP's ability to influence formulation of a Russian National Obsolete Pesticide Management Program. Norway offered an additional 100,000kr (approximately \$14k) beyond the 200,000kr previously committed to the Obsolete Pesticide Project. The Chair will report to the Ministers that Obsolete Pesticides Project work will likely be completed in six or seven of the eleven priority regions in Russia—but that additional effort will depend on supplementary funding.

The U.S. (Ella Barnes, speaking in the absence of the Swedish project lead) mentioned that the Dioxins/Furans Project has enough funds to complete Phase I and to start Phase II.

Regarding the Obsolete Pesticide Project, Russia mentioned regional authorities and local public opinion are very supportive of the ACAP project, but unfortunately, federal authorities in Moscow are not fully aware of this contribution. The Chair proposed that Obsolete Pesticide Project Working Group Members arrange to brief senior Russian officials in the Ministries of Agriculture, Economic Development, and Natural Resources.

Canada suggested that the ACAP project funding table, be adapted to reflect external/in-kind contributions. Denmark supported this idea. The U.S. (Gary Waxmonsky) voiced skepticism that all such contributions could be accurately monetized.

Returning to the financial status of projects, the U.S. (Ella Barnes) stated that current PCB Project funding will support development of business plans for Volgograd and Yaroslavl, the two proposed sites for the plasma arc technology. Russian representatives will be invited to tour this unit in California later in October. Additional funding will be needed once assembly and start-up of the plasma arc unit is accomplished. Norway announced that an additional 200,000kr will be made available to AMAP for the PCB project. Canada noted that its commitments for the PCB and Obsolete Pesticide Projects are, respectively, 25k and 30k Canadian Dollars, and requested that the funding table be so amended.

Denmark noted that the Mercury Project is adequately funded through next spring, and that the U.S. contribution to date was 47k USD, not 50k USD as shown in the table.

Action Item: *Complete the AMAP/ACAP Fact Sheets on PCBs, Dioxins/Furans, Mercury and Cleaner Production.*

6. New Project Proposals

A. Barents Euro Arctic Council/Working Group on Environment (BEAC/WGE)/ACAP Cooperation

The Chair of the Barents Euro Arctic Council/Working Group on Environment, Ann-Britt Ylinen, reported on recent discussions among the Chairs of BEAC/WGE, ACAP, and NEFCO in which projects of joint interest were identified. (See NEFCO's September 2004 "Review of BEAC 'Hot Spots' Projects".) The Steering Committee supported further coordination with BEAC and NEFCO regarding potential joint implementation of one or more "Hot Spots" projects insofar as the latter are consistent with ACAP priorities. In the near term, the Mercury Project Working Group will examine two of the 'Hot Spots' Projects at their upcoming meeting (November 2004).

The BEAC/WGE Chair raised the possibility of joint WGE/ACAP/NEFCO field missions to northwest Russia to review specific proposals, particularly those related to Cleaner Production. The ACAP Chair noted the importance of not duplicating bilateral CP efforts in Russia and specifically requested the Dioxin Project Working Group to coordinate with WGE on a proposed project in the Arkhangelsk Oblast.

In connection with another "Hot Spots" proposal, AMAP reported that approximately \$70k was spent this past summer for a survey of hydrocarbon contamination (with possible PCB components) at abandoned military sites in Franz Josef Land. The U.S. questioned the feasibility of ACAP involvement in this remote region of the high Arctic.

Action Item: *Continue cooperation and outreach with the Barents Euro Arctic Council Working Group on Environment (BEAC/WGE) to include implementation of joint projects addressing contaminant "Hot Spots" in the Arctic.*

B. Permanent Participants

Bryan Neubert from Gwich'in Council International (GCI) presented two project proposals to the Steering Committee: 1) Community Based Models for PCB Mitigation in the Arctic and; 2) Community Based Model for Dioxin and Furan Reduction in the Arctic. The PCB mitigation proposal targets removal of decommissioned PCB-laden equipment and development of a place-based model that can be replicated in other remote indigenous communities in the Arctic. Three RAIPON communities would be selected for inclusion in this project. The second proposal intends to coordinate a dioxin/furan source assessment and community education program to clarify the hazards of backyard burning and the merits of recycling and reducing the amount of trash produced.

Steering Committee members supported in principal both proposals, albeit with somewhat of a preference for the PCB project and some reservations that either would be replicable among indigenous communities in Russia. The U.S. undertook to identify initial funding by the next ACAP Steering Committee meeting and voiced the hope that funding for RAIPON participation could come from a source(s) in Russia. Consideration was also given to including the GCI proposals in the existing ACAP PCB or Dioxin Projects, and whether SAO approval would be needed in this case.

Action Item: *Support implementation of one cooperative project with the Permanent Participants.*

C. Observers

World Wildlife Foundation (WWF) and Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat (IPS) expressed

support for the GCI proposals in that they seek to empower indigenous Arctic communities and could build on preliminary findings of the GEF-funded project, “Persistent Toxic Substances (PTS), Food Security, and Indigenous Peoples of the Russian North.”

The U.K. representative endorsed ACAP’s focus on tangible results and expressed optimism in future interaction with ACAP on Arctic hazardous wastes concerns, subject to further coordination with other elements of the U.K. government.

Action Item: Expand participation of the Arctic Council Observer countries in the work of ACAP.

7. Other Business

The Steering Committee tentatively agreed to hold its next meeting in Sweden April 6-7, 2005. Russia proposed that the meeting after next should take place in Norilsk, preferably in August 2005. Norway suggested that the next ACAP meeting should be scheduled for two full days to avoid a rushed program.

The Chair undertook to prepare a letter to the Russian SAO, Ambassador Churkin, urging the Russian Government to organize a federal program for hazardous waste management.

The Chair asked each of the eight member states of the Steering Committee to contact their SAOs regarding ACAP’s status as a permanent Arctic Council Working Group.

Norway asked the Chair to bring to the attention of the Russia SAO the recent problems encountered by NEFCO and others regarding permits for hazardous waste elimination technology.

Finland reported that the Arctic is a cross-cutting theme in the European Union’s Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership (NDEP), which is supporting construction/expansion of St. Petersburg’s Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant, to be completed in 2005. Thirteen non-nuclear environmental projects are envisioned under NDEP, but insufficient funding has been identified. A senior-level meeting later this fall will review NDEP results to date. It is hoped that Russia will participate. Information is available on the NDEP webpage.

The issue of coordination with the Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM) was deferred to the next ACAP Steering Committee meeting.

Action Item: Develop specific cooperative activities with the Nordic Council of Ministers/Environmental Working Group.

8. ACAP Web page

Norway and ACAP Secretariat provided background information on development of the webpage. It was agreed at the last ACAP meeting that the Secretariat and Norway would take the lead in developing the ACAP webpage. The following principles would be followed:

- Keep it simple;
- Start small and grow as necessary;
- Consider the AMAP template;
- Coordinate with GRID/Arendal;

The webpage was sent to the Steering Committee the week previous to the meeting with request to report any problems logging on. The Steering Committee will need to decide on contents of the webpage, including which publications to include.

The U.S. has set aside \$6,000 to help establish the web page, but an estimated additional \$3,000 is needed for maintenance and software. Norway agreed to finance the first year of webpage upkeep via GRID/Arendal. BEAC/WGE recommended a very simple design with as many links as possible, and commented that they have found their webpage a very good tool to distribute documents. The Secretariat agreed to look into the costs of providing a Russian version of the ACAP web page, at least in part.

Action Item: Complete content addition for the ACAP Website.

9. Guidelines for Developing New Proposals

Norway presented information based on Iceland's paper of about a year ago. (See DRAFT ACAP project development guideline, Sept. 21, 2004.) The Chair called for more attention to project evaluation and urged Finland to organize an evaluation of the Obsolete Pesticide Project in Arkhangelsk. Canada suggested more attention to "project ownership" vs. "problem ownership". Norway noted that the guideline proposal was meant for Steering Committee use, not for presentation to SAOs, and asked for comments on the draft within the next two-three weeks.

Appendix A:

Agenda
ACAP Steering Committee Meeting
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Helsinki, Finland
October 6-7, 2004

Day 1 (October 6, 2004)

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------|--|
| 1. | 9:00-9:25 | Welcome
Report from the Chairman and Secretariat /Announcements
(ACAP, USA),
Ministry of Environment, Finland |
| 2. | 9:25-9:30 | Approval of the Agenda |
| 3. | 9:30-10:00
10:00-10:25 | Project Progress Reports – Annex A Projects
a. PCB's (AMAP Secretariat)
b. Dioxins/Furans (Sweden) |
| | 10:25-11:00 | Break |
| | 11:00-11:30
11:30-12:10 | c. Mercury (Denmark)
d. Obsolete Pesticides (Finland)
i. Promotional Event in Arkhangelsk
ii. DDT removal project in Karelia
iii. Russian in-kind regional work (Russia) |
| | 12:10-12:25 | e. Cleaner Production (Russia) |
| | 12:25-12:45 | f. Fact Sheets (AMAP/ACAP Secretariats) |
| | 12:45-2:15 | Lunch hosted by Finland |
| 4. | 2:15-2:45
2:45-2:50 | Project Progress Reports – Annex B Projects
a. BFR's (Norway)
b. Guidelines for EIA on Radioactive Waste
(Norway) <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Transfer of the project to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Contact Expert Group (CEG) Forum? |

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|---|
| 5. | 2:50-3:20 | Financial Issues
a. Finance Status Table: Changes, Revisions and Project Funding Requirements (Project Steering Group Chairs) |
| | 3:20-3:35 | b. Project Support Fund (NEFCO) |
| | 3:35-3:50 | Break |
| 6. | 3:50-4:55 | New Project Proposals
a. Barents Euro Arctic Council/Working Group on Environment (BEAC/WGE)/ACAP Cooperation
b. Cleaner Production
c. Permanent Participants
d. Arctic Climate Impact Assessment |
| 7. | 4:55-5:40 | Draft Report to SAOs/Ministerial Meeting |
| 8. | 5:40-6:00 | ACAP Web page (ACAP Secretariat, Norway) |
| | 6:00 | Adjourn |
| | 7:00 | Dinner at Savoy Restaurant (hosted by ACAP, USA) |
| Day 2 (October 7, 2004) | | |
| 9. | 9:00-9:30 | Guidelines for developing ACAP Projects (Norway) |
| 10. | 9:30-10:45 | Cooperation/Outreach
a. Expand Participation of Arctic Council Observer Countries
b. BEAC/WGE
c. Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM/EWG)
d. Outreach opportunities with industry to find solutions to environmental problems addressed by ACAP
e. Northern Dimension Action Plan
f. Traditional Food Safety Monitoring Program |
| | 10:45-11:15 | Break |
| 11. | 11:15-12:00 | Wrap-up: Other Issues/Next Meeting |

Appendix B : List of Participants

Canada

Bill Ernst,
Environment Canada, Atlantic Region
Email: bill.ernst@ec.gc.ca
Tel: 902-426-5048
Fax: 902-426-8373

Denmark

Morten Skovagaard Olsen
Chief Programme Coordinator

Danish EPA

Email: mso@mst.dk
Tel: 45 32 66 0245
Fax: 45 32 66 0131

Mikala Klint
Danish EPA
Email: mkl@mst.dk
Tel. (45) 3266 0233

Finland

Henna Haapala
Ministry of the Environment of Finland
Henna.haapala@ymparisto.fi
Tel: (358) 9 1603 9739

Jaakko Henttonen
Consulate of Finland in St. Petersburg
Jaakko.henttonen@formin.fi
Tel: (7) 812 331 7600

Kristiina Isokallio
Finnish Environment Institute
Kristiina.Isokallio@ymparisto.fi

Markku Kukkamaki
Finnish Environment Institute
Email: markku.kukkamaki@ymparisto.fi

Magnus Nystrom
Finnish Environment Institute
Magnus.nystrom@ymparisto.fi

Esko Seppala

Ministry of the Environment
Email: esko.seppala@ymparisto.fi
Tel: 358 9 160 39505
Fax: 358 9 1603 9515

Timo Seppala
Finnish Environment Institute
Timo.seppala@ymparisto.fi

Tarja Varis-Gogulski
Ministry of the Environment of Finland
Marja-leena.vuorenpaa@ymparisto.fi

Marja-Leena Vuorenpaa
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland
Marja-leena.vuorenpaa@ymparisto.fi

Ann-Britt Ylinen
Ministry of the Environment of Finland
Ann-britt.ylinen@ymparisto.fi
Tel: (358) 9 1603 9458

Iceland

Ottar Freyr Gislason
Special Advisor
Iceland Ministry for the Environment
Email: ottar.gislason@environment.is
Tel: (334) 554 8600

Norway

Gunnar Futsaeter
Senior Advisor
Norwegian Pollution Control Authority
Email: gunnar.futsaeter@sft.no
Tel: 47 22 57 34 49

Russia

Elena Kalaida
M&MC Norilsk Nickel
Tel: (7) 3919 350502

Alexander Tsygankov
Russian Norwegian Cleaner Production Center,
Moscow
Email: edcentcp@deol.ru
Tel: 7 095 7874 270
Fax: 7 095 7874 270

Tarja Tolonen
Russian Interpreter

Email: tarja.tolonen@sci.fi

Tel: 47 23 24 16 34

Fax: 41 22 67 67 06

Sweden

Niklas Johansson

Senior Scientific Advisor

Swedish EPA

Email: niklas.johansson@naturvardsverket.se

Tel: 46 8 698 14 38

Fax: 46 8 698 15 85

USA

Bob Dyer

ACAP Chair, US EPA

Email: dyer.bob@epa.gov

Tel: 202-564-6113

Fax: 202-565-2411

Carolyn Barley

ACAP Secretariat, USEPA

Email: barley.carolyn@epa.gov

Tel: 202-564-6438

Fax: 202-565-2411

Gary Waxmonsky

US ACAP Representative, USEPA

Email: waxmonsky.gary@epa.gov

Tel: 202-564-6428

Fax: 202-565-2412

Eleonora Barnes

Russia Project Manager, USEPA

Email: barnes.eleonora@epa.gov

Tel: 202-564-6473

Fax: 202-565-2411

Ana Pomales

USEPA

Email: pomales.ana@epa.gov

Tel: (215) 814 5716

Mika Cleverley

U.S. Embassy Helsinki

Email: cleverleymx@state.gov

Tel: (358-9) 6162-5481

AMAP

Vitaly Kimstach

AMAP Executive Secretary

Email: vitaly.kimstach@amap.no

Permanent Participants

Bryan Neubert

Gwich'in Council International

Email: bneubert@catg.org

(907) 662-2667

Alona Yefimenko

IPS

Email: ay@ghsdk.dk

Tel: (45) 3283 3796

German Embassy

Heidi Freidrich (for Jorg Dettbarn)

Email: ku-1@hels.auswaertiges-amt.de

Tel: (358-9) 458-58-600

United Kingdom

Chris Banahan

Foreign and Commonwealth Office

Email: chris.banahan@fco.gov.uk

Tel: (44) 20 7008 3543

Mark Hill

Email:

Tel: (44) 212 311 3618

Jane Rumble

Polar Regions Unit,

Foreign & Commonwealth Office

Email: jane.rumble@fco.gov.uk

Tel: (44) 20 7008 2610

Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (NEFCO)

Husamuddin Ahmadzai

Email: husamuddin.ahmadzai@nefco.fi

Tel: 358-9-18001 344

Fax: 358-9-630-976

Harro Pitkanen

Email: harro.pitkanen@nefco.fi

World Wildlife Federation

Brettania Walker

International Arctic Programme
bwalker@wwf.no
(47) 2203 6519

Appendix C: List of documents provided to Steering Committee

1. Annex A Project Progress Reports and other Documents

-PCBs

- Multilateral Co-operative Project for phase-out of PCB use, and management of PCB-contaminated wastes in the Russian Federation
- Collection and Storage of PCB containing electrical equipment in Leningrad and St. Petersburg
- Demonstration of a Technology in the Russian Federation for the Destruction of Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) and PCB-containing Capacitors

-Mercury

- ACAP Arctic Mercury Releases Assessment – Sept. 17th, 04
- Reduction of Atmospheric Mercury Releases from the Arctic Countries
- Russian Mercury Assessment Final Sept. 9th, 2004

-Obsolete Pesticides

- Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles in Republic of Karelia, RF
- Environmentally Sound Management of Obsolete Pesticides Stockpiles in the Russian Federation
- Obsolete Pesticides Fact Sheet

-Cleaner Production

- The implementation of cleaner production, eco efficiency and environmental management systems in the production units and management of JSC Norilsk Mining Company, in the Arctic city of Norilsk

2. Annex B Project Progress Reports

- Brominated flame retardants in the Arctic
- Reduction or Elimination of Sources and Releases of Brominated Flame Retardants